

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are pending in the application. Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9, 11-14 and 17-19 have been amended. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

The Office Action has objected to the specification on the basis that the Serial Numbers of the related applications at page 1 should be supplied. The specification has been amended at page 1 to supply the Serial Numbers. Accordingly, it is submitted that the amendment obviates the objection to the specification and, therefore, that the objection should be withdrawn.

The specification has also been amended at page 1 by adding a paragraph that claims the benefit under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) of U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/238,837, filed October 6, 2000, and of U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/269,298, filed February 16, 2001. This claim was made in the Declaration.

Claims 1, 5, 6 and 17-19 have been amended to change phrases that contain "for" followed by a participle to "that" or "to" followed by a verb. For example, in claim 1, "for recording" has been changed to "that records" and, in claim 6, "for defining" has been changed to "to define". It is submitted that these changes do not affect the substance of the so amended claims.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,838,819 to Ruedisueli et al., hereafter Ruedisueli.

The present invention affords a user of a device that captures handwritten marks made on a paper with the capability of a graphical user interface (GUI) of a computer to provide rich set of action inputs, such as copy, cut, paste, drag and drop, move, change size, print and the like, that are useable by applications running in a WINDOWS or MACINTOSH type environment, thereby greatly improving ease of use in handling the

captured handwriting. This is what the original claims intended to describe by the term “GUI”. Independent claims 1, 11 and 17 have been amended to capture this capability more clearly. Thus, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the computing device input system responds to a user’s first input to select a region of the recorded physical writing, that an object creation manager responds to a second input of the user to create an object representation of the selected region for an action and that an object support component of the GUI supports use of the created object to perform the action. This process of object creation can be repeated as many times as is desired, so that several GUI objects can be created in a single page.

Method claim 11 and storage medium claim 17 have been similarly amended to recite, inter alia, the steps (claim 11) or the program instructions (claim 17) that create an object representation of the selected region in response to a second input that indicates an action and that support the use of the created object representation by an object support component of the GUI to perform the action.

In contrast, Ruedisueli discloses a system of managing handwritten notes in which the user capability is limited to making the handwritten notes, providing defining a page identity that is used to make changes, such as editing, merging and the like. Essentially, the problem that Ruedisueli solves is that of assigning a unique identifier to an electronically captured page. This is required because the devices used by Ruedisueli to capture handwritten notes, such as digitizing tablets, have only one physical page surface. Without a way to identify a page, all handwritten notes will appear to be overwritten on top of each other. Ruedisueli provides several ways to identify a page so that handwritings belonging to the same page can be grouped together or merged correctly.

However, Ruedisueli does not disclose or teach extending GUI capability to the user to perform actions. Ruedisueli does provide user capability to navigate the document through selection of Up/Down functions, but does not provide the capability of selecting a region and then providing an input that indicates a multitude of generic actions to be performed on the selected region itself. Furthermore, Ruedisueli does not

teach the capability of selecting and extracting multiple regions from a single page. Ruedisueli uses the selected region as a unique identifier for the particular page from which it was taken. Therefore, there can be only one such region per page. Accordingly, Ruedisueli lacks the object creation manager and object support component as claimed in claim 1 and the steps or program instructions to create an object representation and to support the use of the created object representation or representations as claimed in claims 11 and 17.


For the reason set forth above, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Ruedisueli is obviated by the amendment and should be withdrawn.

The Office Action cites a number of patents that were not applied in the rejections of the claims. These patents have been reviewed, but are believed to be inapplicable to the claims.

It is respectfully requested for the reasons set forth above that the objection to the specification be withdrawn, that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) be withdrawn, that claims 1-19 be allowed and that this application be passed to issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 4-12-04



Paul D. Greeley

Reg. No. 31,019

Attorney for Applicants

Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.

One Landmark Square, 10th Floor

Stamford, CT 06901-2682

(203) 327-4500